REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 4, page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. While the Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions, in the interest of advancing the prosecution, independent claims 1 and 8 are amended to obviate the Examiner's concerns. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

On page 5 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims, are rejected as being unpatentable over WO 00/49769 (Lecheler et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,577,252 (Nelson et al.). On page 6 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with all dependent claims, are rejected as being unpatentable over Hewlett-Packard's commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,948,055 (Pulsipher et al.) in view of the Nelson et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed at least one collection computer relating to a management domain identifier. As exemplified in Fig. 1, one or more collection stations can be designated as a management domain (e.g., paragraph [0020]). As further disclosed, a management domain identifier and a trust name flag can be added to the topology node object. For example, the trust name can be a single bit flag in the collection station object (e.g., paragraph [0030]).

The original intent of the trust flag is to decide if the management station is supposed to perform name resolution on behalf of the collection station. If trust flag

is set to no then the management station can decide to perform the name resolution or other operations to resolve the domain of the event. However, Applicants did not intend the trust flag for use as a server link security feature. Rather, Applicants have envisioned that in duplicate IP networks it is possible that two collection stations could send network events with the same names, and under that anomaly, Applicants have realized that the name can no longer be used or trusted for domain identification. Thus, if the trust name flag is set to, for example, one, then the hostname of the network element as reported from the collection station will be used as the name of the network element, otherwise it will be recomputed at the management station based on, for example, the IP address of the interfaces associated with the network element or node (e.g., paragraph [0030]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites, among other features, receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting; and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag. Claim 8 recites, among other features, at least one management computer for receiving information, from the plurality of collection computers, that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting, the at least one management computer being capable of deciding whether to resolve a hostname in the information being reported by the collection computers based on the binary setting of the trust flag.

The Examiner admits at the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, that "Lecheler does not explicitly show (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier"; and admits at page 7 of the Office Action, that "Pulsipher does not explicitly show (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier." The Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or suggest receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting, as recited in claim 1. Further, the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or suggest deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag, as recited in claim 1. Claim 8 claims a system for managing a computer network reciting similar features.

The Nelson et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher et al. patent. The Nelson et al. patent discloses an assurance of security provided by a first name server to a second named server (col. 1, lines 54-66). However, the disclosed assurance is respect to the system security between name servers (col. 6, lines 62-66), but does not relate to resolving a hostname should a trust status indicate the need for a resolution. Rather, the Nelson et al. patent discloses that a way of allowing a name server to continue across a name server boundary is to have "the original context and the context in the second

name server have the same encapsulated principal' (col. 7, lines 12-15); and that if the two contexts do not encapsulate the same principal, then "name server A cannot continue with the name resolution" (col. 11, lines 62-64). Further, Nelson et al. patent is silent as to a trust flag to indicate a binary setting. The Nelson et al. patent would not have taught or suggested receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting; and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the Lecheler et al. publication and the Pulsipher et al. patent, individually or in combination with the Nelson et al. patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 18, 2006

By: 48,360
for Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620